

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5 and 9-13 are presented for consideration, with Claims 1, 9 and 10 being independent.

The independent claims have been amended to further distinguish Applicant's invention from the cited art. In addition, Claims 11-13 have been added to provide an additional scope of protection. Claims 7 and 8 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Horiuchi '741. In addition, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as allegedly being obvious over Horiuchi in view of Tanaka '336. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 of Applicant's invention relates to a document display method comprised of a first determination step of determining, in a case that a display magnification of document data to be displayed is reduced, whether or not the display magnification of the document data is equal to or greater than a predetermined display magnification, a second determination step of determining whether or not an area of a drawing object displayed in a displayable area is equal to or larger than a first threshold, and an applying step of applying smoothing processing to image data of the document data. As claimed, the smoothing process is applied if it is determined that i) the display magnification of the document data is equal to or greater than the predetermined display magnification, and ii) the area of the drawing object displayed in the displayable area is equal to or larger than the first threshold. The smoothing process is not applied to the image data of the document data if it is determined that i) the display magnification of the document data is equal to or larger than the predetermined display

magnification, and ii) the area of the drawing object displayed in the displayable area is smaller than the first threshold. The image data is displayed in a displaying step.

Support for the amendments to Claim 1 can be found, for example, in Figure 6 and the accompanying specification on page 15, line 8, *et. seq.* In accordance with Applicant's claimed invention, a high performance document display method is provided.

Claims 9 and 10 relate to a document display apparatus and a computer readable recording medium, respectively, and correspond to Claim 1. These claims have thus also been amended to include a determination of whether or not an area of a drawing object displayed in a displayable area is equal to or larger than a first threshold. Smoothing processing is not applied to the image data if the display magnification of the document is equal to or greater than the predetermined display magnification, and the area of the drawing object displayed in the displayable area is smaller than the first threshold.

As discussed in the Amendment of December 4, 2007, the patent to Horiuchi relates to an image processing apparatus that includes a smoothing unit for smoothing input image data. For this purpose, a controller 119, a smoothing unit 114, and an enlargement/reduction ratio setting unit 117 are provided (see Figure 5). The Office Action asserts that Horiuchi teaches to make a smoothing processing determination based on an enlargement/reduction ratio.

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, however, Horiuchi fails to teach or suggest, among other features, making a determination of whether or not an area of a drawing object displayed in a displayable area is equal to or larger than a first threshold, and using this

determination in deciding to apply the smoothing processing to the image data. As set forth in Claim 1, if the area of the drawing object displayed in the displayable area is smaller than the first threshold then smoothing processing is not applied, even if the display magnification of the document data is equal to or larger than the predetermined display magnification.

Claims 9 and 10 can be distinguish from Horiuchi on the same grounds as Claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The secondary citation to Tanaka is directed to an image processing apparatus and is relied upon for its teaching of image data containing character images. Tanaka fails, however, to compensate for the deficiencies in Horiuchi as discussed above with respect to Applicant's independent claims. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in independent Claims 1, 9 and 10 is patentable over the cited art. In addition, dependent Claims 5 and 11-13 set forth additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of this application is deemed to be in order and such action is respectfully requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Malpede/

Scott D. Malpede
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,533

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

SDM/vnm

FCIS_WS 2125031v1